



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,843	12/27/2000	Taira Hanaoka	14196	6311

23389 7590 04/13/2004

SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

CARLSON, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,843

Applicant(s)

HANAOKA ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Carlson

Art Unit

3622



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the paper(s) filed 1/12/04.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 11/17/03 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. There is no copy provided for JP 9-305514.

The information disclosure statement further fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. There is no statement of relevance for JP 10-289-250.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3622

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 6, 7, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schena et al (418) (US6546418) in view of Dougherty et al (US6587859). Schena et al (418) teaches methods and apparatus for scanning printed codes (such as barcode images) which are processed by an extraction element which decodes an associated URL that is used to retrieve advertising information over a network and display it to the user on the apparatus [abstract, 6:19-21]. The displayed content may be video [2:30-56]. Schena et al (418) teaches that the advertising/content displayed may be tailored to the user according to the user's location [7:15-20]. Schena et al does not teach displaying the scanned image. Schena et al does teach scanning the codes for immediate or delayed processing or for reference and that the links may be collected, sorted and prioritized [10:7-12, 43-47]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have stored the history of scanned links as bookmarks so that a user could recall the links for future reference, as is well known with bookmarking websites. Dougherty et al also teaches scanning physically printed code in a publication whereby scanning the code with an optical scanner directs the user to a website for more information [abstract, fig 10, 4:54-67, 5:1-6]. Dougherty et al teaches that the codes may have machine readable content as well as human-readable image content that indicates the destination content and/or destination format. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have included the image content within the machine-scannable code so that the links are more user-friendly and users can determine what content is available at the destination. It would

Art Unit: 3622

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have displayed such image-embedded "multicon linkmarks" on the display so that the suggested bookmarks could be identified and selected for future reference.

Claims 1, 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schena et al (418) in view of Perkowski (US6625581). Schena et al (418) suggests that the apparatus may be a single unit, however Schena et al (418) does not describe the precise form, including a case. Perkowski however also teaches a scanning device which reads printed codes, extracts urls and displays advertising information retrieved from a network. Perkowski teaches that the device may be a stationary kiosk or a portable device shown to have a single case [38:58+, fig 3A8]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provide the device of Schena et al (418) as a portable device as shown by Perkowski so that user's of Schena et al (418)'s system can use the device in a mobile fashion.

Schena et al (418) teaches the use of a network url to display advertising on a web page [9:1-5]. The printed publication that includes the coding is taken to provide an article.

3. Regarding claims 8-11 13, 14, Schena et al (418) teaches that displayed ads are tracked for billing purposes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided an accounting server with charge table (database) to keep track of the billing. Schena et al (418) teaches that the billing may be based on the advertising selected and the number of impressions (access number).

Art Unit: 3622

Official Notice is taken that it is well known to charge for advertising based on other functions such as time of day, the referring article content and the type of ad. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have based advertising billing on any of these methods in order to charge the advertiser for the provided ads. Further, Schena et al (418) teaches sharing revenue/fees among all involved parties including bandwidth carrier (ISP provider), advertiser, content provider, etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have charged the publisher for any portion of any required ISP connection charges so as to reduce/eliminate ISP connections charged for the user – a practice which is well known.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant argues that the applied art does not teach displaying an image as a bookmark. Dougherty et al is provided to teach the idea of image-based publication codes that are scanned and used to jump to a network URL, similar to a bookmark. As stated above, Schena et al teaches the idea of scanning the codes for immediate or delayed processing or for reference and that the links may be collected, sorted and prioritized. One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious to have stored and displayed image-based codes so that a user could jump to various URL content for future reference.

Art Unit: 3622

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Matsumori (US6540143) teaches a barcode scanning system whereby a user screen is provided that displays the scanned results [fig 7, 8]. This enables a user to verify scanned barcode results and troubleshoot/correct scanning errors [7:10-19, 42-65]

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3622

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Carlson whose telephone number is 703-308-3402. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-6p, (off on alternate Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 703-305-8469. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jeffrey D. Carlson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

jdc